



**Intermittent/Reserve Rosters**  
**How to properly order and maintain**

May 24, 2016  
Civil Service On-line System User Session

# Intermittent & Reserve Rosters

In many of the Commonwealth's cities and towns, the regular full-time Police and Fire forces receive additional support through the appointment of intermittent or reserve Fire Fighters or Police Officers.

- Employees classified as intermittent or reserve are eligible to work on an as-needed basis to fill in for regular officers
- What is the difference between reserve and intermittent?
  - Limitation on size of reserve force
- This category of employment is subject to specific restrictions and procedures under civil service law, rule, and policy.
  - MGL 31, § 60

# Intermittent & Reserve Rosters

How are appointments made to the reserve or intermittent force?

- Requisition made in NeoGov
- HRD refers list of eligible candidates in civil service on-line system
- AA follows standard appointment procedures

How does a reserve or intermittent employee gain permanent full-time status?

Can an intermittent or reserve employee continuously decline full-time appointment?

- MGL 31, section 60 – decline or fail to respond for full-time positions on three occasions must be removed from roster.

Age requirement – 50 years old can not be referred out for permanent full-time vacancy

Transfers

# Intermittent & Reserve Rosters

- In 2008, the Civil Service Commission (CSC) issued a decision in Ragucci v. Saugus, 21 MCSR 667 (2008), where it basically established that individuals on an intermittent roster who share the same appointment/employment date should be in the same order as their names appeared on the underlying certification list from which they were appointed as reserves. The CSC further determined that although they share the same appointment/employment date, they should not be considered “tied” when making appointments to permanent, full-time positions.
- Departments under consent decree must order their roster list accordingly
- So, if there are 5 people on an intermittent roster who have the same appointment date to the reserve force and the Appointing Authority is looking to make appointments from the roster, it must be prepared to provide sound and sufficient reasons for selecting the 5<sup>th</sup> person ahead of the 1<sup>st</sup> person on the list, even though they have the same appointment date.
- In 2011 the CSC issued a decision in Stacy v. Methuen, 24 MCSR 386 (2011) in which the Ragucci decision played a significant part of the analysis.

Q & A

Next Session  
June 21, 2016